

## INTRODUCTION

The City of Fresno (City) has determined that a program-level environmental impact report (EIR) is required for the proposed West Area Neighborhoods Specific Plan (herein the “Specific Plan”) Project (proposed project) pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

This EIR examines the planning, construction and operation of the project. The program-level approach is appropriate for the proposed project because it allows comprehensive consideration of the reasonably anticipated scope of the Specific Plan and associated full buildout scenario. Subsequent individual development that requires further discretionary approvals will be examined in light of this EIR to determine whether additional environmental documentation must be prepared.

This EIR has been prepared as a Program EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168. A program-level analysis considers the broad environmental effects of the Specific Plan. This EIR will also function as a “first tier” EIR, as explained below.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 states that a program EIR is an EIR which may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either:

- 1) Geographically;
- 2) As logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions;
- 3) In connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program; or
- 4) As individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways.

The program-level analysis considers the broad environmental effects of the proposed Specific Plan. The EIR examines all phases of the project including planning, construction and operation. The program-level approach is appropriate for the Specific Plan because it allows comprehensive consideration of the reasonably anticipated scope of development plan; however, not all aspects of the future development are known at this stage in the planning process. Individual development projects within the Plan Area that require further discretionary approvals will be examined in light of this EIR to determine whether additional environmental documentation must be prepared.

According to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(5), “[a] program EIR will be most helpful in dealing with subsequent activities if it deals with the effects of the program as specifically and comprehensively as possible.” Later environmental documents (EIRs, mitigated negative declarations, or negative declarations) can incorporate by reference materials from the program EIR regarding regional influences, secondary impacts, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[d][2]). These later documents need only focus on new impacts that have not been considered before (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[d][3]).

Section 15168(c), entitled “Use with Later Activities,” provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

Subsequent activities in the program must be examined in the light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared:

- (1) If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, a new Initial Study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a Negative Declaration.
- (2) If the agency finds that pursuant to Section 15162, no new effects could occur or no new mitigation measures would be required, the agency can approve the activities as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required.
- (3) An agency shall incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into subsequent actions in the program.
- (4) Where the subsequent activities involve site specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the program EIR.

Here, the City anticipates preparing a written checklist or similar device whenever landowners within the Plan Area submit applications for site-specific approvals (i.e. small-lot tentative maps, conditional use permits, or other discretionary entitlements). The checklist would serve, in part, as a consistency checklist to determine if the application for site specific approval is consistent with the General Plan, Specific Plan, Conditions of Approval, and Mitigation Measures. It would also include a review of the project details relative to what was anticipated and analyzed in the program EIR (i.e. are there new environmental effects that were not covered by the program EIR). In some cases, a site-specific application (i.e. commercial use) may have specific issues associated with the project, or business, that this program EIR could not anticipate given the information that was available at the time. In those situations, the detailed site-specific information from that application could have site-specific effects not wholly anticipated in this EIR and would require some additional environmental review. (See also CEQA Guidelines section 15063, subd. (b)(1)(C).)

Future site-specific approvals may also be narrowed pursuant to the rules for tiering set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15152. “[T]iering is a process by which agencies can adopt programs, plans, policies, or ordinances with EIRs focusing on ‘the big picture,’ and can then use streamlined CEQA review for individual projects that are consistent with such...[first tier decisions] and are...consistent with local agencies’ governing general plans and zoning.” (*Koster v. County of San Joaquin* (1996) 47 Cal.App.4th 29, 36.) Section 15152 provides that, where a first-tier EIR has “adequately addressed” the subject of cumulative impacts, such impacts need not be revisited in second- and third-tier documents. Furthermore, second- and third-tier documents may limit the examination of impacts to those that “were not examined as significant effects” in the prior EIR or “[a]re susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions, or other means.” In general, significant environmental effects have been “adequately addressed” if the lead agency determines that:

(A) they have been mitigated or avoided as a result of the prior environmental impact report and findings adopted in connection with that prior environmental impact report; or

(B) they have been examined at a sufficient level of detail in the prior environmental impact report to enable those effects to be mitigated or avoided by site specific revisions, the imposition of conditions, or by other means in connection with the approval of the later project.

Here, as noted above, the City anticipates preparing a written checklist(s) or similar device whenever landowners within the Specific Plan area submit applications for site-specific approvals (i.e. tentative maps, conditional use permits, or other discretionary entitlements). The checklist would serve in part as a consistency checklist to determine if the application for site specific approval is consistent with the General Plan, Specific Plan, Conditions of Approval, and Mitigation Measures, and it would also include a review of the project details relative to what was anticipated and analyzed in the program EIR (i.e. have all significant environmental impacts identified been “adequately addressed” in the program EIR). Thus, if a new analysis is required for these site-specific actions, it would focus on impacts that cannot be “avoided or mitigated” by mitigation measures that either (i) were adopted in connection with the Specific Plan or (ii) were formulated based on information in this EIR.

In addition, for purely residential projects consistent with the Specific Plan, the City intends to preserve its ability to treat such projects as exempt from CEQA pursuant to Government Code section 65457. Subdivision (a) of that statute provides that “[any residential development project, including any subdivision, or any zoning change that is undertaken to implement and is consistent with a specific plan for which an [EIR] has been certified after January 1, 1980, is exempt from the requirements of [CEQA].” The statutes go on to say, moreover, that “if after adoption of the specific plan, an event as specified in Section 21166 of the Public Resources Code occurs, the exemption provided by this subdivision does not apply unless and until a supplemental [SEIR] for the specific plan is prepared and certified in accordance with the provisions of [CEQA]. After a supplemental [SEIR] is certified, the exemption ... applies to projects undertaken pursuant to the specific plan.” (See also CEQA Guidelines section 15182.)

When purely residential projects are proposed, the City will consider whether they qualify for this exemption or whether the West Area Neighborhoods Specific Plan EIR must be updated through a supplement to this EIR or a subsequent EIR as required by Public Resources Code section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15162 and 15163.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following provides a brief summary and overview of the proposed project. Chapter 2.0 of this EIR includes a detailed description of the proposed project, including maps and graphics. The reader is referred to Chapter 2.0 for a more complete and thorough description of the components of the proposed project.

The proposed Specific Plan will establish the land use planning and regulatory guidance, including the land use and zoning designations and policies, for the approximately 7,077-acre Plan Area. The Specific Plan will serve as a bridge between the Fresno General Plan and individual development applications in the Plan Area.

The proposed Specific Plan refines the General Plan's land use vision for the Plan Area. The draft land use map proposes the relocation of higher density land uses away from the most western and southwestern portions of the Plan Area where they are distant from public transit and community amenities and transfers those higher density land use designations to major corridors. The West Area Neighborhoods Specific Plan land use plan utilizes the City's existing General Plan land use designations to maintain or re-designate some parcels in the Plan Area. See Table 2.0-1 for a summary of the existing and proposed land uses within the city limits, growth area, and Plan Area. See Figure 2.0-6 for the proposed General Plan land use designations.

The parcels that are currently within the County will not be rezoned. Instead, upon a proposal to annex unincorporated land into the city limits, the City of Fresno would pre-zone the land to a zone that is consistent with the General Plan land use. Once annexation occurs, the County zoning would no longer apply to the parcel.

The Specific Plan land use plan that was recommended by the Steering Committee would allow for the future development of up to 54,953 dwelling units (DU) (including 67 DU in the commercial category, 47,072 DU in the residential category and 7,814 DU in the mixed use category), and 60,621,006 square feet (SF) of non-residential uses. The proposed land use plan also designates public facility uses that are currently existing within the Plan Area, including schools and churches. In the northern portion of the Plan Area, Fire Station No. 18 is temporarily located off of West Bullard Avenue at 5938 North La Ventana Avenue. Fire Station 18 will be relocated to a permanent location on the south side of the 6000 block of West Shaw Avenue to maximize the department's response time goal. Additionally, the proposed land use plan would allow for approximately 248 acres of park, open space, and ponding basin uses. The Specific Plan also includes circulation and utility improvements, some of which are planned in the City's current program for capital improvements.

Refer to Chapter 2.0, Project Description, for a more complete description of the project details.

## AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

This Draft EIR addresses environmental impacts associated with the proposed West Area Neighborhoods Specific Plan that are known to the City of Fresno, were raised during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process, or raised during preparation of the Draft EIR. This Draft EIR discusses potentially significant impacts associated with aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural and tribal resources, geology, soils and seismicity (including mineral resources), greenhouse gases, climate change, and energy, hazards and hazardous materials (including wildfire), hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services and recreation, transportation and circulation, and utilities.

The City received thirteen written comments on the NOP for the proposed West Area Neighborhoods Specific Plan Draft EIR. Two comments were also received during the Scoping Meeting. A copy of each letter is provided in **Appendix A** of this Draft EIR. The comments covered the following aspects of the proposed Specific Plan, each of which is considered a public concern:

- Conversion of undeveloped land to urban use
- Light, glare, and skyglow
- Traffic congestion from automobiles and large trucks, ensuring safe routes to schools, and provision of alternative transportation infrastructure
- Annexation of county properties into the city
- Parkland, trail, and ball field impacts
- Need for aesthetics improvements, including tree planting
- Air quality and pollution concerns, including dust from construction and agricultural uses, and air pollution along Highway 99
- Project impact on regional stormwater, drainage, and flood control

## ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or to the location of the project which would reduce or avoid any of the significant impacts of the project, and which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project. The alternatives analyzed in this EIR include the following four alternatives in addition to the proposed Specific Plan:

- No Project (Existing General Plan) Alternative;
- Additional Annexation Alternative;
- Regional Park Alternative;
- Lower Density Alternative.

Alternatives are described in detail in Section 5.0, Alternatives to the Proposed Project. A comparative analysis of the proposed project and each of the project alternatives is provided in Table ES-1. As shown in the Table, the Lower Density Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because it results in the least adverse environmental impacts when compared to the proposed project. The Lower Density Alternative would decrease or slightly decrease impacts to 13 of the 15 environmental issues. This is mostly due to the preservation of the existing farmland and rural residential areas along the southern and western boundaries of the Plan Area, and the decrease in development associated with the reduced densities. It is noted that none of the project alternatives would fully eliminate any of the significant and unavoidable impacts that would occur under the proposed Specific Plan; however, the significant and unavoidable impacts that would result under the proposed Specific Plan would occur to a lesser extent under the Lower Density Alternative. The Regional Park Alternative is the next best alternative as it would decrease or slightly decrease impacts to five of the 15 environmental issues.

**TABLE ES-1: COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE IMPACTS TO THE PROPOSED SPECIFIC PLAN**

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE</i>	<i>NO PROJECT (EXISTING GENERAL PLAN) ALTERNATIVE</i>	<i>ADDITIONAL ANNEXATION ALTERNATIVE</i>	<i>REGIONAL PARK ALTERNATIVE</i>	<i>LOWER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE</i>
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	Equal	Equal	Equal	Less
Agricultural Resources	Equal	More	Equal	Less
Air Quality	More	Slightly More	Slightly Less	Less
Biological Resources	Equal	Slightly More	Equal	Less
Cultural and Tribal Resources	Equal	Slightly More	Equal	Less
Geology, Soils and Seismicity	Slightly More	Slightly More	Slightly Less	Slightly Less
Greenhouse Gas, Climate Change, and Energy	More	Slightly More	Slightly Less	Slightly Less
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Equal	Slightly More	Equal	Less
Hydrology and Water Quality	Equal	Slightly More	Equal	Less
Land Use	Slightly More	Equal	Equal	Equal
Noise	More	More	Equal	Less
Population and Housing	More	Slightly More	Equal	Equal
Public Services and Recreation	More	Slightly More	Slightly Less	Less
Transportation and Circulation	More	Slightly More	Equal	Slightly Less
Utilities	Slightly More	Slightly More	Slightly Less	Slightly Less

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The environmental impacts of the proposed project, the impact level of significance prior to mitigation, the proposed mitigation measures and/or adopted policies and standard measures that are already in place to mitigate an impact, and the impact level of significance after mitigation are summarized in Table ES-2.

**TABLE ES-2: WEST AREA NEIGHBORHOODS SPECIFIC PLAN IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES**

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
<b>AESTHETICS</b>			
Impact 3.1-1: Specific Plan implementation would not result in substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.1-2: Project implementation would not substantially damage scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.1-3: Specific Plan implementation would result in substantial adverse effects or degradation of visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	PS	<i>None feasible.</i>	SU
Impact 3.1-4: Specific Plan implementation has the potential to result in light and glare impacts.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.1-1:</b> <i>In order to reduce the potential for glare from buildings and structures within the project area, the Preliminary and Final Design Review plan(s) for all future projects in the Plan Area shall show that the use of reflective building materials that have the potential to result in glare that would be visible from sensitive receptors located in the vicinity of the project sites shall be prohibited. The City of Fresno Planning and Development Department shall ensure that the approved project uses appropriate building materials with low reflectivity to minimize potential glare nuisance to off-site receptors. These requirements shall be included in future project improvement plans, subject to review and approval by the City of Fresno.</i></p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.1-2:</b> <i>A lighting plan for all future projects in the Plan Area subject to section 15-2508 and section 15-2015 of the City of Fresno Municipal Code shall be prepared prior to the approval of the design review for each project site. The lighting plan shall demonstrate that the lighting systems and other exterior lighting throughout the project area have been designed to minimize light spillage onto adjacent properties to the greatest extent feasible, consistent with section 15-2508. – Lighting and Glare and section 15-2015 – Outdoor Lighting and Illumination of the City of Fresno Municipal Code. Use of LED lighting or other proven energy efficient lighting shall be required for facilities to be dedicated</i></p>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		to the City of Fresno for maintenance. These requirements shall be included in future project improvement plans, subject to review and approval by the City of Fresno.	
<b>AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
Impact 3.2-1: Specific Plan implementation would convert Important Farmlands to non-agricultural land uses.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.2-1:</b> Prior to initiation of grading activities, the project proponent shall implement the following measure to mitigate impacts on Important Farmland located on the site: The project proponent shall mitigate the loss of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance within the Plan Area at a 1:1 ratio. The acreage of lost farmland shall be determined using the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Model. The LESA Model evaluates measures of soil resource quality, a given project's size, water resource availability, surrounding agricultural lands, and surrounding protected resource lands. Once the acreage of farmland converted is determined, one of the following mitigation options shall be utilized to mitigate the loss: Restrictive Covenants or Deeds, In Lieu Fees, Mitigation Banks, Fee Title Acquisition, Conservation Easements, or Land Use Regulation. Should the City develop a Farmland Preservation Program before future construction within the Plan Area begins, the project proponent shall mitigate for Farmland pursuant to the Program.</p> <p>The mitigation shall be verified by the City of Fresno for each phase of the project during improvement plan review.</p>	SU
Impact 3.2-2: Specific Plan implementation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.2-2:</b> Prior to initiation of grading activities, the project proponent shall implement the following measure to mitigate impacts related to agriculturally-zoned land located on the site: The project proponent shall mitigate the loss of land zoned for agricultural use within the Plan Area at a 1:1 ratio. Once the acreage of land zoned for agricultural use which would be converted by the project is determined, one of the following mitigation options shall be utilized to mitigate the loss: Restrictive Covenants or Deeds, In Lieu Fees, Mitigation Banks, Fee Title Acquisition, Conservation Easements, or Land Use Regulation.</p> <p>The mitigation shall be verified by the City of Fresno for each phase of the project during improvement plan review.</p>	SU

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable



<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
Impact 3.2-3: Specific Plan implementation would not conflict with existing zoning, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.2-4: Future development of the Plan Area would not result in other changes in the existing environment that would lead to the abandonment of agricultural operations and conversion of farmland or forest land to non-agricultural or forest land use.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
<i>AIR QUALITY</i>			
Impact 3.3-1: Specific Plan implementation would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-1:</b> Prior to the issuance of building permits for new development projects within the Plan Area, the project applicant(s) shall show on the building plans that all major appliances (dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers) to be provided/installed are Energy Star-certified appliances or appliances of equivalent energy efficiency. Installation of Energy Star-certified or equivalent appliances shall be verified by the City of Fresno Planning and Development Department prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.	SU
Impact 3.3-2: Specific Plan implementation during project construction would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-2:</b> In order to contribute in minimizing exhaust emission from construction equipment, prior to issuance of grading or building permits, whichever occurs first, the property owner(s)/developer(s) shall provide a list of all construction equipment proposed to be used in the Plan Area for projects that are subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (i.e., non-exempt projects). This list may be provided on the building plans. The construction equipment list shall state the make, model, and equipment identification number of all the equipment. The property owner(s)/developer(s) shall consult with the City of Fresno Planning and Development Department on the feasibility of utilizing cleaner (e.g. higher engine tier) construction equipment than proposed. The property owner(s)/developer(s) shall implement recommendations for the use of cleaner construction	SU

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>equipment, as determined by the City of Fresno Planning and Development Department. Compliance will be verified by the City of Fresno Planning and Development Department.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-3:</b> During construction activities, the construction contractors shall ensure that the equipment shall be properly serviced and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations; and, that all nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less in compliance with Section 2449 of the California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Article 4.8, Chapter 9.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-4:</b> In order to reduce ROG emissions from construction activities, prior to issuance of a building permit for projects that are subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (i.e., non-exempt projects), the property owner/developer shall require the construction contractor provide a note on the construction plans indicating that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All coatings and solvents will have a volatile organic compound (ROG) content lower than required under Rule 4601 (i.e., super compliant paints).</li> <li>• All architectural coatings shall be applied either by (1) using a high-volume, low-pressure spray method operated at an air pressure between 0.1 and 10 pounds per square inch gauge to achieve a 65 percent application efficiency; or (2) manual application using a paintbrush, hand-roller, trowel, spatula, dauber, rag, or sponge, to achieve a 100 percent applicant efficiency.</li> </ul> <p>The construction contractor may also use precoated/natural colored building materials.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-5:</b> During all construction activities, the project proponent shall implement the following dust control practices identified in Tables 6-2 and 6-3 of the GAMAQI (2002).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, or vegetative ground cover.</li> <li>b. All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.</li> <li>c. All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall control fugitive dust emissions by application of water or by presoaking.</li> </ol>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>d. When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, or at least six inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.</p> <p>e. All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours when operations are occurring. The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden.</p> <p>f. Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.</p> <p>g. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 5 mph; and</p> <p>h. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-6:</b> Asphalt paving shall be applied in accordance with SJVAPCD Rule 4641. This rule applies to the manufacture and use of cutback asphalt, slow cure asphalt and emulsified asphalt for paving and maintenance operations.</p>	
Impact 3.3-3: Specific Plan implementation during project operation would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-7.</b> The property owner(s)/developer(s) shall incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the Project Conditions of Approval. Possible mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For site-specific development that requires refrigerated vehicles, the construction documents shall demonstrate an adequate number of electrical service connections at loading docks for plugging in the anticipated number of refrigerated trailers to reduce idling time and emissions.</li> <li>Applicants for manufacturing and light industrial uses shall consider energy storage (i.e., battery) and combined heat and power (CHP, also known as cogeneration) in appropriate applications to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use.</li> <li>Site-specific developments with truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking spaces shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with CARB Rule 2845 (13 California Code of Regulations</li> </ul>	SU

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>[CCR] Chapter 10, Section 2485).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require that 240-volt electrical outlets or Level 3 chargers be installed in parking lots that would enable charging of neighborhood electric vehicles (NEVs) and/or battery powered vehicles.</li> <li>Maximize use of solar energy including solar panels; installing the maximum possible number of solar energy arrays on building roofs throughout the city to generate solar energy.</li> <li>Maximize the planting of trees in landscaping and parking lots.</li> <li>Use light-colored paving and roofing materials.</li> <li>Require use of electric or alternatively fueled street-sweepers with HEPA filters.</li> <li>Require use of electric lawn mowers and leaf blowers.</li> <li>Utilize only Energy Star heating, cooling, and lighting devices, and appliances.</li> <li>Use of water-based or low volatile organic compound (VOC) cleaning products.</li> </ul>	
Impact 3.3-4: Specific Plan implementation has the potential to result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) affecting a substantial number of people.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-8:</b> The project applicant(s) shall require developers of projects within the Specific Plan Area with the potential to generate significant odor impacts as determined through review of SJVAPCD odor complaint history for similar facilities and consultation with the SJVAPCD, to prepare an odor impact assessment and to implement odor control measures recommended by the SJVAPCD or the City as needed to reduce the impact to a level deemed acceptable by the SJVAPCD. The City's Planning and Development Department shall verify that all odor control measures have been incorporated into the project design specifications prior to issuing a permit to operate.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-9:</b> Prior to future discretionary approval for individual projects within the Specific Plan Area that require environmental evaluation under CEQA, the City of Fresno shall evaluate new development proposals for new industrial or warehousing land uses that: (1) have the potential to generate 100 or more truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered transport refrigeration units, and (2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, or nursing homes), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use. Such projects shall submit a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to the City Planning and Development Department. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the most current State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the SJVAPCD. If the HRA shows that the incremental health risks exceed their respective thresholds, as established by the SJVAPCD at the time a project is considered, the Applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACTs), including appropriate</p>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>enforcement mechanisms to reduce risks to an acceptable level. T-BACTs may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restricting idling on site or electrifying warehousing docks to reduce diesel particulate matter;</li> <li>Requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles;</li> <li>Provide charging infrastructure for: electric forklifts, electric yard trucks, local drayage trucks, last mile delivery trucks, electric and fuel-cell heavy duty trucks; and/or</li> <li>Install solar panels, zero-emission backup electricity generators, and energy storage to minimize emissions associated with electricity generation at the project site.</li> </ul> <p>T-BACTs identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site plan.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-10:</b> Locate sensitive land uses (e.g., residences, schools, and daycare centers) to avoid incompatibilities with recommended buffer distances identified in the most current version of the CARB Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (CARB Handbook). Sensitive land uses that are within the recommended buffer distances listed in the CARB Handbook shall provide enhanced filtration units or submit a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to the City. If the HRA shows that the project would exceed the applicable SJVAPCD thresholds, mitigation measures capable of reducing potential impacts to an acceptable level must be identified and approved by the City.</p>	
Impact 3.3-5: Specific Plan implementation has the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.	PS	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-1</b> through <b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-10</b>	LS
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>			
Impact 3.4-1: Specific Plan implementation could directly or indirectly have a substantial adverse effect through habitat modifications or reductions, cause populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, substantially eliminate a community,	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-1:</b> Future project proponent(s) of development projects within the Specific Plan Area shall implement the following measure to avoid or minimize impacts on special-status invertebrate species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preconstruction surveys/habitat assessments for valley elderberry longhorn beetle (<i>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</i>), California linderiella (<i>Linderiella occidentalis</i>),</li> </ul>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
or substantially reduce the number of, or restrict the range of, an endangered, rare or threatened species, including those considered candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS.		<p>midvalley fairy shrimp (<i>Branchinecta mesoallensis</i>), and vernal pool fairy shrimp (<i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in all areas of suitable habitat within the project disturbance area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If valley elderberry longhorn beetle (<i>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</i>), California linderiella (<i>Linderiella occidentalis</i>), midvalley fairy shrimp (<i>Branchinecta mesoallensis</i>), or vernal pool fairy shrimp (<i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>), or their suitable habitat, is found during preconstruction surveys/habitat assessments within the disturbance area, activities within 200 feet of the find shall cease until appropriate measures have been completed, which may include an application for incidental take, or it is determined by the qualified biologist and City staff, in coordination with USFWS and CDFW, that the species will not be harmed by the activities. Any sightings or incidental take shall be reported to USFWS and CDFW immediately.</li> <li>Construction personnel performing activities within aquatic habitats and other suitable habitats (i.e., elderberry shrubs) to be disturbed by project activities shall receive worker environmental awareness training from a qualified biologist to instruct workers to recognize the species, their habitats, and measures being implemented for its protection.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2:</b> Future project proponent(s) of development projects within the Specific Plan Area shall implement the following measure to avoid or minimize impacts on special-status amphibian and reptile species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preconstruction surveys/habitat assessments for California tiger salamander (CTS) (<i>Ambystoma californiense</i>), western spadefoot (<i>Spea hammondi</i>), blunt-nosed leopard lizard (<i>Gambelia sila</i>), California glossy snake (<i>Arizona elegans occidentalis</i>), coast horned lizard (<i>Phrynosoma blainvillii</i>), northern California legless lizard (<i>Anniella pulchra</i>), and western pond turtle (<i>Emys marmorata</i>) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in all areas of suitable habitat within the project disturbance area.</li> <li>If California tiger salamander (CTS) (<i>Ambystoma californiense</i>), western spadefoot (<i>Spea hammondi</i>), blunt-nosed leopard lizard (<i>Gambelia sila</i>), California glossy snake (<i>Arizona elegans occidentalis</i>), coast horned lizard (<i>Phrynosoma blainvillii</i>), northern California legless lizard (<i>Anniella pulchra</i>), or western pond turtle (<i>Emys marmorata</i>), or their suitable habitat, is found during preconstruction surveys/habitat assessments within the disturbance area, activities within 200 feet of the find shall cease until appropriate measures have been completed, which may include an application for incidental take, or it is determined by the qualified biologist and City staff, in coordination with USFWS and CDFW, that the species will</li> </ul>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>not be harmed by the activities. Any sightings or incidental take shall be reported to USFWS and CDFW immediately.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If western pond turtles are found during preconstruction surveys, a qualified biologist, with approval from CDFW, shall move the turtles to the nearest suitable habitat outside the area subject to project disturbance. The construction area shall be reinspected whenever a lapse in construction activity of 2 weeks or more has occurred.</li> <li>Construction personnel performing activities within aquatic habitats and adjacent suitable uplands to be disturbed by project activities shall receive worker environmental awareness training from a qualified biologist to instruct workers to recognize western pond turtle, their habitats, and measures being implemented for its protection.</li> <li>Construction personnel shall observe a 15-miles-per-hour speed limit on unpaved roads.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-3:</b> Prior to any ground disturbance in areas which may support suitable breeding or nesting habitat for burrowing owl, a preconstruction survey of the parcel(s) to be developed shall be completed for burrowing owl in accordance with CDFW survey guidelines (California Department of Fish and Game 1995). On the parcel where the activity is proposed, the biologist shall survey the proposed disturbance footprint and a 500-foot radius from the perimeter of the proposed footprint to identify burrows and owls. Adjacent parcels under different land ownership need not be surveyed. Surveys shall take place near sunrise or sunset in accordance with CDFW guidelines. All burrows or burrowing owls shall be identified and mapped. Surveys shall take place no earlier than 30 days prior to construction. During the breeding season (February 1 to August 31), surveys shall document whether burrowing owls are nesting in or directly adjacent to disturbance areas. During the nonbreeding season (September 1 to January 31), surveys shall document whether burrowing owls are using habitat in or directly adjacent to any disturbance area. Survey results shall be valid only for the season (breeding or nonbreeding) during which the survey is conducted. If burrowing owls and/or suitable burrows are not discovered, then further mitigation is not necessary.</p> <p>If burrowing owls are found during the breeding season (February 1 to August 31), the project proponent(s) shall avoid all nest sites that could be disturbed by project construction during the remainder of the breeding season or while the nest is occupied by adults or young. Avoidance shall include establishment of a non-disturbance buffer zone (described below). Construction may occur during the breeding season if a qualified biologist monitors the nest and determines that the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation or that the juveniles from the occupied burrows have fledged. During the nonbreeding season (September 1 to January 31), the project proponent(s) shall avoid the</p>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>owls and the burrows they are using, if possible. Avoidance shall include the establishment of a buffer zone (described below). During the breeding season, buffer zones of at least 250 feet in which no construction activities can occur shall be established around each occupied burrow (nest site). Buffer zones of 160 feet shall be established around each burrow being used during the nonbreeding season. The buffers shall be delineated by highly visible, temporary construction fencing.</p> <p>If occupied burrows for burrowing owls cannot be avoided, passive relocation shall be implemented. Owls may be excluded from burrows in the immediate impact zone under an authorization from the CDFW. Such exclusion would be anticipated to include the installation of one-way doors in burrow entrances. These doors would be in place for 48 hours prior to excavation and monitored daily for 1 week to confirm that the owl has abandoned the burrow. Whenever possible, burrows must be excavated using hand tools and refilled to prevent reoccupation (California Department of Fish and Game 1995). Plastic tubing or a similar structure should be inserted in the tunnels during excavation to maintain an escape route for any owls inside the burrow. CDFW has the authority to authorize a variation to the above described exclusion method.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-4:</b> Prior to any ground disturbance conducted during the Swainson's hawk nesting season (March 15 to September 15) in areas which may support suitable habitat for Swainson Hawk, a USFWS/CDFW-approved biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for Swainson's hawk no earlier than 30 days prior to construction in order to determine whether occupied Swainson's hawk nests are located within 1,000 feet of the parcel(s) to be developed. If any potentially-occupied nests within 1,000 feet are off the project site, then their occupancy shall be determined by observation from public roads or by observations of Swainson's hawk activity (e.g. foraging) near the project site. A written summary of the survey results shall be submitted to the City of Fresno.</p> <p>During the Swainson's hawk nesting season (March 15 to September 15), construction activities within 1,000 feet of occupied nests or nests under construction shall be prohibited to prevent nest abandonment. If site-specific conditions, or the nature of the covered activity (e.g., steep topography, dense vegetation, and limited activities) indicate that a smaller buffer could be used, the City of Fresno may coordinate with CDFW/USFWS to determine the appropriate buffer size. If young fledge prior to September 15, construction activities could proceed normally. If the active nest site is shielded from view and noise from the project site by other development, topography, or other features, the project proponent(s) can apply to the City of Fresno for a waiver of this avoidance measure. Any waiver must</p>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable



ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>also be approved by USFWS and CDFW. While nest is occupied, activities outside the buffer can take place.</p> <p>All active nest trees shall be preserved on site, if feasible.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-5:</b> Future project proponent(s) of development projects within the Specific Plan Area shall implement the following measure to avoid or minimize impacts to the black-crowned night heron (<i>Nycticorax nycticorax</i>), California horned lark (<i>Eremophila alpestris actia</i>), double-crested cormorant (<i>Phalacrocorax auratus</i>), great egret (<i>Ardea alba</i>), Least Bell's vireo (<i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i>), snowy egret (<i>Egretta thula</i>), tricolored blackbird (<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>), and western yellow-billed cuckoo (<i>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis</i>) that may occur on the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preconstruction surveys for active nests of black-crowned night heron (<i>Nycticorax nycticorax</i>), California horned lark (<i>Eremophila alpestris actia</i>), double-crested cormorant (<i>Phalacrocorax auratus</i>), great egret (<i>Ardea alba</i>), Least Bell's vireo (<i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i>), snowy egret (<i>Egretta thula</i>), tricolored blackbird (<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>), and western yellow-billed cuckoo (<i>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis</i>) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in all areas of suitable habitat within 500 feet of project disturbance. Surveys shall be conducted within 14 days before commencement of any construction activities that occur during the nesting season (February 15 to August 31) in a given area.</li> <li>• If any active nests, or behaviors indicating that active nests are present, are observed, appropriate buffers around the nest sites shall be determined by a qualified biologist to avoid nest failure resulting from project activities. The size of the buffer shall depend on the species, nest location, nest stage, and specific construction activities to be performed while the nest is active. The buffers may be adjusted if a qualified biologist determines it would not be likely to adversely affect the nest. If buffers are adjusted, monitoring will be conducted to confirm that project activity is not resulting in detectable adverse effects on nesting birds or their young. No project activity shall commence within the buffer areas until a qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged or the nest site is otherwise no longer in use.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-6:</b> Prior to any ground disturbance related to construction activities, a biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey in areas which may support suitable breeding or denning habitat for San Joaquin kit fox. The survey shall establish the presence or absence of San Joaquin kit fox and/or suitable dens and evaluate use by kit foxes in accordance with USFWS survey guidelines (USFWS, 1999). Preconstruction surveys shall be conducted not earlier than 30 days from commencing ground</p>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>disturbance. On the parcel where activity is proposed, the biologist shall survey the proposed disturbance footprint and a 250-foot radius from the perimeter of the proposed footprint to identify San Joaquin kit fox and/or suitable dens. Adjacent parcels under different land ownership need not be surveyed. The status of all dens shall be determined and mapped. Written result of preconstruction surveys shall be submitted to the USFWS within 5 working days after survey completion and before start of ground disturbance. Concurrence by the USFWS is not required prior to initiation of construction activities. If San Joaquin kit fox and/or suitable dens are not discovered, then further mitigation is not necessary. If San Joaquin kit fox and/or suitable dens are identified in the survey area, the following measure shall be implemented.</p> <p>If a San Joaquin kit fox den is discovered in the proposed development footprint, the den shall be monitored for 3 days by a CDFW/USFWS-approved biologist using a tracking medium or an infrared beam camera to determine if the den is currently being used. Unoccupied dens shall be destroyed immediately to prevent subsequent use. If a natal or pupping den is found, the USFWS and CDFW shall be notified immediately. The den shall not be destroyed until the pups and adults have vacated and then only after further consultation with USFWS and CDFW. If kit fox activity is observed at the den during the initial monitoring period, the den shall be monitored for an additional 5 consecutive days from the time of the first observation to allow any resident animals to move to another den while den use is actively discouraged. For dens other than natal or pupping dens, use of the den can be discouraged by partially plugging the entrance with soil such that any resident animal can easily escape. Once the den is determined to be unoccupied, it may be excavated under the direction of the biologist. Alternatively, if the animal is still present after 5 or more consecutive days of plugging and monitoring, the den may have to be excavated when, in the judgement of a biologist, it is temporarily vacant (i.e., during the animal's normal foraging activities).</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-7:</b> Future project proponent(s) of development projects within the Specific Plan Area shall implement the following measures to avoid or minimize impacts on bats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If removal of suitable roosting areas (i.e. buildings, trees, shrubs, bridges, etc.) must occur during the bat pupping season (April 1 through July 31), surveys for active maternity roosts shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. The surveys shall be conducted from dusk until dark.</li> <li>• If a special-status bat maternity roost is located, appropriate buffers around the roost sites shall be determined by a qualified biologist and implemented to avoid destruction or abandonment of the roost resulting from habitat removal or other project activities. The size</li> </ul>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>of the buffer shall depend on the species, roost location, and specific construction activities to be performed in the vicinity. No project activity shall commence within the buffer areas until the end of the pupping season (August 1) or until a qualified biologist confirms the maternity roost is no longer active.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-8:</b> Future project proponent(s) of development projects within the Specific Plan Area shall implement the following measure to avoid or minimize impacts to the American badger (<i>Taxidea taxus</i>), Fresno kangaroo rat (<i>Dipodomys nitratoideis exilis</i>), and San Joaquin pocket mouse (<i>Perognathus inornatus</i>) that may occur on the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preconstruction surveys for indications of American badger (<i>Taxidea taxus</i>), Fresno kangaroo rat (<i>Dipodomys nitratoideis exilis</i>), and San Joaquin pocket mouse (<i>Perognathus inornatus</i>) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in all areas of suitable habitat within 500 feet of project disturbance. Surveys shall be conducted within 14 days before commencement of any construction activities that occur in a given area.</li> <li>• If any active habitat areas, or behaviors indicating that active habitat is present, are observed, appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures, including but not limited to buffer areas, shall be required. The avoidance and mitigation measures shall be determined by the qualified biologist and implemented by the project proponent(s).</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-9:</b> Prior to construction in undisturbed areas, future project proponent(s) shall retain a biologist to perform plant surveys. The surveys shall be performed during the floristic season. If any of these plants are found during the surveys, the project proponent(s) shall contact the CNPS to obtain the appropriate avoidance and minimization measures. The project proponent(s) shall also implement the avoidance and minimization measures.</p>	
Impact 3.4-2: Specific Plan implementation has the potential to have substantial adverse effect on federally- or state-protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-10:</b> If a proposed project will result in the significant alteration or fill of a federally protected wetland, a formal wetland delineation conducted according to USACE accepted methodology would be required for each project to determine the extent of wetlands on a project site. The delineation shall be used to determine if federal permitting and mitigation strategy are required to reduce project impacts. Acquisition of permits from USACE for the fill of wetlands and USACE approval of a wetland mitigation plan would ensure a “no net loss” of wetland habitat within the Planning Area. Appropriate wetland mitigation/creation shall be implemented in a ratio according to the size of the impacted wetland.</p>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-11:</b> In addition to regulatory agency permitting, Best Management Practices identified from a list provided by the USACE shall be incorporated into the design and construction phase of the project to ensure that no pollutants or siltation drain into a federally protected wetland. Project design features such as fencing, appropriate drainage and incorporating detention basins shall assist in ensuring project-related impacts to wetland habitat are minimized to the greatest extent feasible.	
Impact 3.4-3: Specific Plan implementation would not have substantial adverse effects on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-12:</b> A pre-construction clearance survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if a proposed project will result in the removal or impact to any riparian habitat and/or a special-status natural community with potential to occur in the Specific Plan Area, compensatory habitat-based mitigation shall be required to reduce project impacts. Compensatory mitigation must involve the preservation or restoration or the purchase of off-site mitigation credits for impacts to riparian habitat and/or a special-status natural community. Mitigation must be conducted in-kind or within an approved mitigation bank in the region. The specific mitigation ratio for habitat-based mitigation shall be determined through consultation with the appropriate agency (i.e., CDFW or USFWS) on a case-by-case basis. The project applicant/developer for a proposed project shall develop and implement appropriate mitigation regarding impacts on their respective jurisdictions.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-13:</b> A pre-construction clearance survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if a proposed project will result in significant impacts to streambeds or waterways protected under Section 1600 of Fish and Wildlife Code and Section 404 of the CWA. The project applicant/developer for a proposed project shall consult with partner agencies such as CDFW and/or USACE to develop and implement appropriate mitigation regarding impacts on their respective jurisdictions, determination of mitigation strategy, and regulatory permitting to reduce impacts, as required for projects that remove riparian habitat and/or alter a streambed or waterway. The project applicant/developer shall implement mitigation as directed by the agency with jurisdiction over the particular impact identified.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-14:</b> Prior to project approval, a pre-construction clearance survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if a proposed project will result in project-related impacts to riparian habitat or a special-status natural community or if it may result in direct or incidental impacts to special-status species associated with riparian or wetland habitats. The project applicant/developer for a proposed project shall be obligated to address project-specific impacts to</p>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<i>special-status species associated with riparian habitat through agency consultation, development of a mitigation strategy, and/or issuing incidental take permits for the specific special-status species, as determined by the CDFW and/or USFWS.</i>	
Impact 3.4-4: Specific Plan implementation would not interfere substantially with the movement of native fish or wildlife species or with established wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.4-5: Specific Plan implementation would not conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.4-6: Specific Plan implementation would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
<b>CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES</b>			
Impact 3.5-1: Specific Plan implementation may cause a substantial adverse change to a significant historical or archaeological resource, as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5, or a significant tribal cultural resource, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.5-1:</b> <i>The City shall require project applicants for future projects with intact extant building(s) more than 45 years old to provide a historic resource technical study evaluating the significance and data potential of the resource. If significance criteria are met, detailed mitigation recommendations shall be included as part of the technical study. All work shall be performed by a qualified architectural historian meeting Secretary of the Interior Standards. The historic resource technical study shall be submitted to the City for review prior to any site disturbance within the vicinity of the building(s).</i></p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.5-2:</b> <i>If cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, and isolated artifacts and features) are discovered during the course of construction within the Specific Plan Area, work shall be halted immediately within 50 meters (165 feet) of the discovery, the City of Fresno shall be notified, and a qualified archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications</i></p>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p><i>Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery.</i></p> <p><i>The City of Fresno shall consider mitigation recommendations presented by the qualified archaeologist for any unanticipated discoveries and future project proponents shall carry out the measures deemed feasible and appropriate. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. The project proponent shall be required to implement any mitigation necessary for the protection of cultural resources.</i></p>	
Impact 3.5-2: Specific Plan implementation may disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.5-3:</b> <i>If human remains are found during ground disturbance activities associated with implementation of the Specific Plan, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance within 50 feet of the discovery and a qualified archeological monitor and the coroner of Fresno County shall be contacted as stated in Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If it is determined that the remains are Native American, the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendent (MLD) from the deceased Native American. The MLD may then make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code section 5097.98. The landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further disturbance if:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a) the Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a MLD or the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission;</i></li> <li><i>b) the descendent identified fails to make a recommendation; or</i></li> <li><i>c) the landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.</i></li> </ul>	LS
<b>GEOLOGY, SOILS AND SEISMICITY</b>			
Impact 3.6-1: Specific Plan implementation would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
involving strong seismic ground shaking or seismic related ground failure.			
Impact 3.6-2: Specific Plan construction and implementation has the potential to result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.6-1:</b> Prior to clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling, or excavation for each phase of the Project, the Project proponent shall submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the RWQCB to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ amended by 2010-0014-DWQ & 2012-0006-DWQ). The SWPPP shall be designed with Best Management Practices (BMPs) that the RWQCB has deemed as effective at reducing erosion, controlling sediment, and managing runoff. These include: covering disturbed areas with mulch, temporary seeding, soil stabilizers, binders, fiber rolls or blankets, temporary vegetation, and permanent seeding. Sediment control BMPs, installing silt fences or placing straw wattles below slopes, installing berms and other temporary run-on and runoff diversions. These BMPs are only examples of what should be considered and should not preclude new or innovative approaches currently available or being developed. Final selection of BMPs will be subject to approval by City of Fresno and the RWQCB. The SWPPP will be kept on site during construction activity and will be made available upon request to representatives of the RWQCB.	LS
Impact 3.6-3: Specific Plan implementation has the potential to be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of Specific Plan implementation, and potentially result in landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.6-2:</b> Prior to earthmoving activities associated with future development activities within the Plan Area, a certified geotechnical engineer, or equivalent, shall be retained to perform a final geotechnical evaluation of the soils at a design-level as required by the requirements of the California Building Code Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 18, Section 1803.1.1.2 related to expansive soils and other soil conditions. The evaluation shall be prepared in accordance with the standards and requirements outlined in California Building Code, Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 16, Chapter 17, and Chapter 18, which addresses structural design, tests and inspections, and soils and foundation standards. The final geotechnical evaluation shall include design recommendations to ensure that soil conditions do not pose a threat to the health and safety of people or structures, including threats from liquefaction or lateral spreading. The grading and improvement plans, as well as the storm drainage and building plans shall be designed in accordance with the recommendations provided in the final geotechnical evaluation.	LS
Impact 3.6-4: The Specific Plan would not be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property.	PS	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure 3.6-2</b>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Impact 3.6-5: Project implementation has the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.6-3:</b> <i>If any paleontological resources are found during grading and construction activities, all work shall be halted immediately within a 200-foot radius of the discovery until a qualified paleontologist has evaluated the find.</i></p> <p><i>Work shall not continue at the discovery site until the paleontologist evaluates the find and makes a determination regarding the significance of the resource and identifies recommendations for conservation of the resource, including preserving in place or relocating within the Plan Area, if feasible, or collecting the resource to the extent feasible and documenting the find with the University of California Museum of Paleontology.</i></p>	LS
Impact 3.6-6: Specific Plan implementation would not have the potential to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State, or in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
<b>GREENHOUSE GASES, CLIMATE CHANGE, AND ENERGY</b>			
Impact 3.7-1: Specific Plan implementation would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	LS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.7-1:</b> <i>Prior to the City's approval of the project (i.e. the Specific Plan) as well as individual development projects within the Specific Plan Area, the Director of the City Planning and Development Department, or designee, shall confirm that the Specific Plan and each individual development project is consistent with the final version of the GHG Reduction Plan Update, and shall implement all measures deemed applicable to the Specific Plan and each individual development project through the GHG Reduction Plan Update-Project Consistency Checklist (Appendix B of the GHG Reduction Plan Update).</i>	--
Impact 3.7-2: Specific Plan implementation would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary use of energy resources.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable



ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Impact 3.7-3: Specific Plan implementation would not generate a cumulative impact on climate change from increased project-related greenhouse gas emissions.	LS/LCC	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure 3.7-1.</b>	--
<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>			
Impact 3.8-1: Specific Plan implementation has the potential to create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.8-1:</b> Prior to bringing hazardous materials onsite, the applicant shall submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) to Fresno County Environmental Health Division (CUPA) for review and approval. If during the construction process the applicant or their subcontractors generates hazardous waste, the applicant must register with the CUPA as a generator of hazardous waste, obtain an EPA ID# and accumulate, ship and dispose of the hazardous waste per Health and Safety Code Ch. 6.5. (California Hazardous Waste Control Law).</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.8-2:</b> Prior to initiation of any ground disturbance activities within 50 feet of a well, the applicant shall hire a licensed well contractor to obtain a well abandonment permit from Fresno County Environmental Health Department, and properly abandon the on-site wells, pursuant to review and approval of the City Engineer and the Fresno County Environmental Health Department.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.8-3:</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the property owners and/or developers of properties shall ensure that a Phase I ESA (performed in accordance with the current ASTM Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process [E 1527]) shall be conducted for each individual property prior to development or redevelopment to ascertain the presence or absence of Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs), Historical Recognized Environmental Condition (HRECs), and Potential Environmental Concerns (PECs) relevant to the property under consideration. The findings and conclusions of the Phase I ESA shall become the basis for potential recommendations for follow-up investigation, if found to be warranted.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.8-4:</b> In the event that the findings and conclusions of the Phase I ESA for a property result in evidence of RECs, HRECs and/or PECs warranting further investigation, the property owners and/or developers of properties shall ensure that a Phase II ESA shall be conducted to determine the presence or absence of a significant impact to the subject site from hazardous materials.</p> <p>The Phase II ESA may include but may not be limited to the following: (1) Collection and laboratory analysis of soils and/or groundwater samples to ascertain the presence or absence of significant</p>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>concentrations of constituents of concern; (2) Collection and laboratory analysis of soil vapors and/or indoor air to ascertain the presence or absence of significant concentrations of volatile constituents of concern; and/or (3) Geophysical surveys to ascertain the presence or absence of subsurface features of concern such as USTs, drywells, drains, plumbing, and septic systems. The findings and conclusions of the Phase II ESA shall become the basis for potential recommendations for follow-up investigation, site characterization, and/or remedial activities, if found to be warranted.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.8-5:</b> In the event the findings and conclusions of the Phase II ESA reveal the presence of significant concentrations of hazardous materials warranting further investigation, the property owners and/or developers of properties shall ensure that site characterization shall be conducted in the form of additional Phase II ESAs in order to characterize the source and maximum extent of impacts from constituents of concern. The findings and conclusions of the site characterization shall become the basis for formation of a remedial action plan and/or risk assessment.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.8-6:</b> If the findings and conclusions of the Phase II ESA(s), site characterization and/or risk assessment demonstrate the presence of concentrations of hazardous materials exceeding regulatory threshold levels, prior to the issuance of a grading permit, property owners and/or developers of properties shall complete site remediation and potential risk assessment with oversight from the applicable regulatory agency including, but not limited to, the CalEPA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) or Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and Fresno County Environmental Health Division (FCEHD). Potential remediation could include the removal or treatment of water and/or soil. If removal occurs, hazardous materials shall be transported and disposed at a hazardous materials permitted facility.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.8-7:</b> Prior to the issuance of a building permit for an individual property within the Plan Area with residual environmental contamination, the agency with primary regulatory oversight of environmental conditions at such property ("Oversight Agency") shall have determined that the proposed land use for that property, including proposed development features and design, does not present an unacceptable risk to human health, if applicable, through the use of an Environmental Site Management Plan (ESMP) that could include institutional controls, site-specific mitigation measures, a risk management plan, and deed restrictions based upon applicable risk-based cleanup standards. Remedial action plans, risk management plans and health and safety plans shall be required as determined by the Oversight Agency for a given property under applicable environmental laws, if not already completed, to prevent an unacceptable risk to human health, including workers during and after</p>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>construction, from exposure to residual contamination in soil and groundwater in connection with remediation and site development activities and the proposed land use.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.8-8:</b> For those sites with potential residual volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in soil, soil gas, or groundwater that are planned for redevelopment with an overlying occupied building, a vapor intrusion assessment shall be performed by a licensed environmental professional. If the results of the vapor intrusion assessment indicate the potential for significant vapor intrusion into the proposed building, the project design shall include vapor controls or source removal, as appropriate, in accordance with Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) or the Fresno County Environmental Health Division (FCEHD) requirements. Soil vapor mitigations or controls could include passive venting and/or active venting. The vapor intrusion assessment as associated vapor controls or source removal can be incorporated into the ESMP.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.8-9:</b> In the event of planned renovation or demolition of residential and/or commercial structures on the subject site, prior to the issuance of demolition permits, asbestos and lead based paint (LBP) surveys shall be conducted in order to determine the presence or absence of asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and/or LBP. Removal of friable ACM, and non-friable ACMs that have the potential to become friable, during demolition and/or renovation shall conform to the standards set forth by the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs).</p> <p>The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) is the responsible agency on the local level to enforce the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs) and shall be notified by the property owners and/or developers of properties (or their designee(s)) prior to any demolition and/or renovation activities. If asbestos-containing materials are left in place, an Operations and Maintenance Program (O&amp;M Program) shall be developed for the management of asbestos containing materials.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.8-10:</b> Prior to the import of a soil to a particular property within the Plan Area as part of that property's site development, such soils shall be sampled for toxic or hazardous materials to determine if concentrations exceed applicable Environmental Screening Levels for the proposed land use at such a property, in accordance with Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) or the Fresno County Environmental Health Division (FCEHD) requirements.</p>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
Impact 3.8-2: Specific Plan implementation has the potential to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.8-3: Specific Plan implementation would not result in impacts from being included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.8-4: Specific Plan implementation would not result in safety hazards for people residing or working in the Plan Area as a result of public airport or public use airport.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.8-5: Specific Plan implementation would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.8-6: Specific Plan implementation would not have the potential to expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury or death from wildland fires, or result in any other wildfire impact.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*PS – potentially significant*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*B – beneficial impact*

*LS – less than significant*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
<i>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</i>			
Impact 3.9-1: The Specific Plan would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.9-2: The Specific Plan would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during operation.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.9-3: The Specific Plan would not decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.9-4: The Specific Plan would not alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite, or create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--

*CC – cumulatively considerable**PS – potentially significant**LCC – less than cumulatively considerable**B – beneficial impact**LS – less than significant**SU – significant and unavoidable*

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
Impact 3.9-5: The Specific Plan would not release pollutants due to Plan Area inundation by flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.9-6: The Specific Plan would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
<i>LAND USE</i>			
Impact 3.10-1: The proposed Specific Plan would not physically divide an established community.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.10-2: The proposed Specific Plan would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
<i>NOISE</i>			
Impact 3.11-1: Specific Plan implementation could potentially substantially increase mobile noise levels at existing and proposed receptors.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.11-1:</b> Future project proponent(s) for development projects in the Plan Area which involve residential or other noise sensitive uses shall implement performance standards for noise reduction for new residential and noise sensitive uses exposed to exterior community noise levels from transportation sources above 65 dB Ldn or CNEL, as shown on Exhibit G: Existing Plus Project Plus Cumulative Noise Contours of the West Area Specific Plan Noise Impact Study prepared by MD Acoustics (dated September 30, 2020), or as identified by a project-specific acoustical analysis based on the target acceptable noise levels set in Table 9-2 of the Fresno General Plan Noise Element (Table 3.11-5 of this EIR).	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p><i>If future exterior noise levels are expected to exceed the applicable standards presented in Table 9-2 of the Fresno General Plan Noise Element (Table 3.11-5 of this EIR), the mitigation measure presented below shall be implemented, as applicable. A qualified Acoustical Consultant shall provide information demonstrating that site specific mitigation will be effective at reaching the applicable noise standard.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Install noise walls, berms and/or a combination of a landscaped berm with wall, and reduced barrier height in combination with increased distance or elevation differences between noise source and noise receptor. The City of Fresno has established a maximum allowable height for noise walls of 15 feet. As such, the noise walls, berms and/or a combination of a landscaped berm with wall shall not exceed 15 feet.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The aforementioned measure is not exhaustive and alternative designs may be approved by the City, provided that a qualified Acoustical Consultant submits information demonstrating that the alternative design(s) will achieve and maintain the specific targets for outdoor activity areas.</i></p>	
Impact 3.11-2: Specific Plan implementation would not substantially increase noise levels associated with construction and demolition activities.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.11-2:</b> Construction within the Plan Area must follow the City's Municipal Noise Code Section 10-109 which exempts construction, repair or remodeling work accomplished pursuant to a building, electrical, plumbing, mechanical, or other construction permit issued by the City or other governmental agency, or to site preparation and grading, provided such work takes place between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on any day except Sunday.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.11-3:</b> The project proponent(s) and/or construction contractor(s) shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City of Fresno Planning and Development Department, that buildout of the Specific Plan complies with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Truck traffic associated with project construction shall be limited to within the permitted construction hours, as listed in the City's Municipal Code above.</li> <li>Stationary construction noise sources such as generators or pumps shall be located at least 300 feet from sensitive land uses, as feasible.</li> <li>Construction staging areas shall be located as far from noise sensitive land uses as feasible.</li> <li>During construction, the contractor shall ensure all construction equipment is equipped with appropriate noise attenuating devices. The use of manufacturer certified mufflers would generally reduce the construction equipment noise by 8 to 10 dBA.</li> <li>Idling equipment shall be turned off when not in use.</li> </ul>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equipment shall be maintained so that vehicles and their loads are secured from rattling and banging.</li> </ul>	
Impact 3.11-3: Specific Plan implementation would not substantially increase noise vibration association with construction activities.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.11-4:</b> For future projects which would require the use of highly vibratory equipment in the Plan Area, an additional site- and project-specific analysis shall be conducted by a noise and vibration specialist prior to project approval. The analysis shall evaluate potential ground-borne vibration impacts to existing structures and sensitive receptors, and shall also recommend additional mitigation measures, as necessary. The recommendations of the site- and project-specific analysis shall be implemented by the project proponent(s), to the satisfaction of the City of Fresno Planning and Development Department.	LS
Impact 3.11-4: Specific Plan implementation would not substantially increase stationary noise at sensitive receptors.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.11-5:</b> In order to reduce the potential for stationary noise impacts, development projects in the Plan Area shall implement the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoid the placement of new noise producing uses in proximity to noise-sensitive land uses;</li> <li>Apply noise level performance standards provided in Table 9-2 of the City of Fresno General Plan Noise Element (Table 3.11-5 of this EIR) to proposed new noise producing uses; and</li> <li>Require new noise-sensitive uses in near proximity to noise-producing facilities include mitigation measures that would ensure compliance with noise performance standards in Table 9-2 of the City of Fresno General Plan Noise Element (Table 3.11-5 of this EIR).</li> </ul>	LS
Impact 3.11-5: Specific Plan implementation would not substantially increase ambient interior noise at future sensitive receptors.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.11-6:</b> Prior to approval, site- and project-specific noise analyses development projects under the proposed Specific Plan shall be completed and submitted to the City in order to fine-tune and finalize noise reduction features. The site-specific noise analyses must demonstrate the interior noise level will not exceed the City's 45 dBA CNEL noise limit.</p> <p>A qualified Acoustical Consultant shall provide information demonstrating that site specific mitigation will be effective at reaching the applicable noise standard, which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Install noise walls, berms and/or a combination of a landscaped berm with wall, and reduced barrier height in combination with increased distance or elevation differences between noise source and noise receptor. The City of Fresno has established a maximum allowable height of 15 feet. As such, the noise walls, berms and/or a combination of a landscaped berm with wall shall not exceed 15 feet.</li> </ul>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable



ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilize façades with substantial weight and insulation.</li> <li>Install sound-rated windows for primary sleeping and activity areas.</li> <li>Install sound-rated doors for all exterior entries at primary sleeping and activity areas.</li> <li>Install acoustic baffling of vents for chimneys, attic and gable ends.</li> <li>Install mechanical ventilation systems that provide fresh air under closed window conditions.</li> </ul> <p>The aforementioned measures are not exhaustive and alternative designs may be approved by the City, provided that a qualified Acoustical Consultant submits information demonstrating that the alternative design(s) will achieve and maintain the specific targets for outdoor activity areas and interior spaces.</p>	
Impact 3.11-6: Specific Plan implementation would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport or aircraft noise.	LS	None required.	--
<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>			
Impact 3.12-1: Implementation of the Specific Plan would not induce unplanned substantial population growth.	LS	None required.	--
Impact 3.12-2: Implementation of the Specific Plan would not displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing.	LS	None required.	--
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION</b>			
Impact 3.13-1: The proposed Specific Plan may require the construction of fire department facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.13-1:</b> Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for each future dwelling unit to be developed within the Plan Area (and prior to issuance of building permits for non-residential uses), the applicant shall pay all applicable project impact fees per the impact fee schedule.	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant

SU – significant and unavoidable

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
Impact 3.13-2: The proposed Specific Plan may result in, or have the potential to require the construction of police department facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.13-3: The proposed Specific Plan may result in, or have the potential to require the construction of school facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.13-2:</b> <i>Prior to the issuance of future building permits for each dwelling unit to be constructed in the West Area Neighborhoods Specific Plan, the applicant shall pay applicable school fees mandated by SB 50 to the Central Unified School District (CUSD) and provide documentation of said payment to the City.</i>	SU
Impact 3.13-4: The proposed Specific Plan may result in, or have the potential to require the construction of park facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.13-3:</b> <i>As detailed plans for future parks and recreational facilities in the Plan Area are submitted to the City, environmental review of proposed facilities shall be completed to meet the requirements of CEQA. Typical impacts from park facilities include air quality/greenhouse gas emissions, noise, traffic, and lighting.</i>	SU
Impact 3.13-5: The proposed Specific Plan may result in, or have the potential to require the construction of other public facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.13-4:</b> <i>As detailed plans for future libraries and other public facilities in the Plan Area are submitted to the City, environmental review of proposed facilities shall be completed to meet the requirements of CEQA. Typical impacts from park facilities include air quality/greenhouse gas emissions, noise, traffic, and lighting.</i>	SU
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</b>			
Impact 3.14-1: Implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
Impact 3.14-2: Implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guideline section 15064.3, subdivision (b).	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.14-3: Implementation of the Specific Plan would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.14-4: Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
<i>UTILITIES</i>			
Impact 3.15-1: The proposed Specific Plan would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	PS	<i>None feasible.</i>	SU
Impact 3.15-2: The proposed Specific Plan would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Plan Area that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the Specific Plan's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--

*CC – cumulatively considerable**LCC – less than cumulatively considerable**LS – less than significant**PS – potentially significant**B – beneficial impact**SU – significant and unavoidable*

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
Impact 3.15-3: The proposed Specific Plan would not require or result in construction of new or expanded water facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.	PS	<i>None feasible.</i>	SU
Impact 3.15-4: The proposed Specific Plan would not have insufficient water supplies available to serve the Plan Area and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 3.15-5: The proposed Specific Plan would not require or result in the construction of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	PS	<i>None feasible.</i>	SU
Impact 3.15-6: The proposed Specific Plan would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Plan Area's solid waste disposal needs, and would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LS	<i>None required.</i>	--
<i>OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS</i>			
Impact 4.1: Specific Plan implementation will contribute to the cumulative degradation of the existing visual character of the region.	LS/LCC	<i>None required.</i>	--

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*PS – potentially significant*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*B – beneficial impact*

*LS – less than significant*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
Impact 4.2: Specific Plan implementation may contribute to the cumulative impact on agricultural land and uses.	CC/SU	<i>None feasible.</i>	--
Impact 4.3: Specific Plan implementation would contribute to cumulative impacts on the region's air quality.	CC/SU	<i>None feasible.</i>	--
Impact 4.4: Specific Plan implementation would not contribute to the cumulative loss of biological resources including habitats and special status species.	LS/LCC	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 4.5: Specific Plan implementation would not contribute to the cumulative loss of cultural and tribal resources.	LS/LCC	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 4.6: Specific Plan implementation may contribute to cumulative impacts on geologic and soils characteristics.	LS/LCC	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 4.7: Cumulative impact on climate change from increased project-related greenhouse gas emissions.	LS/LCC	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 4.8: Specific Plan implementation may contribute to cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.	LS/LCC	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 4.9: Cumulative impacts related to hydrology and water quality.	LS/LCC	<i>None required.</i>	--

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*PS – potentially significant*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*B – beneficial impact*

*LS – less than significant*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
Impact 4.10: Specific Plan implementation may contribute to cumulative impacts on communities and local land uses.	LS/LCC	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 4.11: Specific Plan implementation may contribute to the cumulative exposure of existing and future noise-sensitive land uses or to increased noise resulting from cumulative development.	LS/LCC	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 4.12: Specific Plan implementation may contribute to cumulative impacts on population growth and displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing.	LS/LCC	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 4.13: Specific Plan implementation may contribute to cumulative impacts on public services.	CC/SU	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 4.14: Specific Plan implementation may contribute to cumulative impacts to the regional transportation network.	LS/LCC	<i>None required.</i>	--
Impact 4.15: Specific Plan implementation may contribute to cumulative impacts on utilities.	LS/LCC	<i>None required.</i>	--

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*PS – potentially significant*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*B – beneficial impact*

*LS – less than significant*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*